

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. Applicant's Appeal Brief filed 9/2/2009 has been fully considered and is deemed persuasive. The previous rejections are thus withdrawn.
2. However, after a new analysis and search, a new grounds of rejection is presented below.
3. Claims 2-6,8-17,20-24,26-31,33-41,43-63 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rochford, Tim (The Impact of Mobile Application Technology on Today's Workforce, March 2001) in view of Fox et al (US Publication No 20020077823).**

6. The combination of Rochford and Fox together give a complete view of the "iConverse Mobile Studio" which substantially teaches the claimed invention. The motivation to combine is the obvious implementation of the "iConverse Mobile Studio" to provide tailored content to a variety of different client devices.

7. In reference to claim 50, Rochford teaches a method comprising:
receiving device independent content comprising markup information identifying one or more device feature values wherein the device-independent content is responsive to a content

Art Unit: 2457

request from a network terminal device (Rochford, page 21 ¶ 3 teaches access to content (i.e. receiving), page 22 ¶ 2 teaches the content is XML based) (Fox, ¶s 62-63, teaches the content comprising capability parameters of devices);

identifying one or more device feature associated with the network terminal device (Rochford, page 17 ¶ 3 teaches identify device, and page 24 teaches “Device Service”);

matching at least one of the device feature associated with the device independent content with at least one of the device feature associated with the network terminal device; based on said matching, converting device independent content into device-specific content adapted to said network terminal device (Rochford, page 17 ¶ 3 teaches “iConverse Interaction Server”, page 24 teaches “Transformation Engine”);

providing the device specific content to the network terminal device (page 17 ¶ 3 teaches “dynamically serves the content”).

8. Independent claims 51,52,53,56,58 correspond to independent claim 50 and are slight variations thereof. Therefore claims 51,52,53,56,58 are rejected based upon the same rationale as given for claim 50.

9. In reference to claim 2, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶ 46 teaches a device pane.

10. In reference to claim 3, this is taught by Rochford, see at least page 17 ¶ 3 teaches identify device, and page 24 teaches “Device Service”. Fox ¶ 46 teaches a device pane.

11. In reference to claims 4-6, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶s 49 and 120.

12. In reference to claims 8-10, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶s 121-122, inherent parts of markup rendering.

13. In reference to claim 11, this is taught by Rochford, see at least page 20, screenshot 2.

Art Unit: 2457

14. In reference to claims 12-13, this is taught by Rochford, see at least page 17 ¶ 3, and page 24 teaches “Device Service”.
15. In reference to claim 14, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶ s 49,122,123.
16. In reference to claim 15, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶s 49,122,123.
17. In reference to claim 16, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶s 122-124.
18. In reference to claim 17, this is taught by Fox, see at least ¶ 49.
19. In reference to claims 54-55, this is taught by Rochford, see at least page 20 ¶ 2 teaches alternative version of the same content for the same device. Fox ¶ 67 also teaches alternative versions of content for a device, and ¶ 63 teaches content metatags for a device. (the alternative versions satisfy the first and second portions)
20. In reference to claim 61, this is taught by Rochford, see at least page 20 ¶ 1.
21. In reference to claim 62, this is taught by Rochford, see at least page 17 ¶ 3 teaches identify device, and page 24 teaches “Device Service”. Fox ¶ 46 teaches a device pane.
22. Dependent claims 20-24,26-31,34-49,57,59,60,63 correspond to dependent claims 2-6,8-17,54,55,61,62 and are slight variations thereof. Therefore claims 20-24,26-31,34-49,57,59,60,63 are rejected based upon the same rationale as given for claims 2-6,8-17,54,55,61,62.

Conclusion

23. The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.
24. Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its

Art Unit: 2457

corresponding support in the specification. (See MPEP chapter 2163.03 section (I.) and chapter 2163.04 section (I.) and chapter 2163.06)

25. In formulating a response/amendment, Applicant is encouraged to take into consideration the prior art made of record but not relied upon, as it is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Form 892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy M Osman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457

May 10, 2010